

Task

Subject: OW Feedback on NDPE
Start Date: 3/11/2020
Due Date: 9/30/2020

Status: In Progress
Percent Complete: 0.1

Total Work: 0
Actual Work: 0

Owner: Montilla, Alex

From: Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 4:40 PM
To: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: PFAS Dashboard

OW wanted to talk to me at 4 on short notice, prepping for the discussion between ORD and OW on Thursday. This exchange was one outcome.

They said they could produce the national layer of their proposed format in short order, pending getting the right people to work on it. Will keep after them.

In the mean time please review their comments in the first doc above – they proposed some edits to the popup screen, as well as some concerns about the rest of the explanatory text.

Andrew J. R. Gillespie, Ph. D.
Associate Director, US EPA/ORD/CEMM
ORD Executive Lead for PFAS R&D



Document1_srm...



DW Spatial Data in
PFAS Explorer - I...

From: Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 5:02 PM
To: Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: PFAS Dashboard

Part 2...



DW Spatial Data in
PFAS Explorer - I...

From: Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2020 5:43 PM
To: Blancato, Jerry <Blancato.Jerry@epa.gov>

Cc: Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>

Subject: OW ORD PFAS Meeting Summary

There was a lot of discussion on the issue of using zip codes for the UCMR 3 data. The Director of the Drinking Water program emphatically in the middle of the discussion stated that a point location was the only information he would accept. Supporting discussion bullets.

- Zip code data in UCMR 3 is provided by the utilities and OW does not QA it.
- There may be multiple wells or sources of water for a utility and only one may have had a high reading.
- Concern that the color coding of large zip code area would generate anxiety with the public.
- Thought that a point with utility provider may get public to contact their water provider for more information, although there was discussion that this would also probably get a lot of state calls.
- OW agreed to provide points for all OW sites, but doing so would take resources and the work would need to be prioritized with other OW priorities. ***They did not give any estimated dates as to when they could get this information to ORD.*** Until they do it will delay the deployment of the tool.

OW had concern about the disclaimers, were very concerned that this would not be used or expressed as exposure data. They had a similar issue with the EJ Screen tool and suggested that we look at the language that they used.

There was concern that when the NDPE tool is final that it be shown to all the Offices and Regions again. Not sure if this would be meetings or just providing them maybe a demo and the tool to review.

EJ Screen also gave the states 2-weeks to look at the tool before it was released and that it needed to be socialized at a number of state levels. This allowed the states to ask questions and get prepared to answer questions from their constituents. There seemed to be general agreement that this was a good path to follow.

Andy had to leave a bit early for another demo, but David Dunlap basically agreed to getting the points, updating the tool, socializing it again, the early use period for states and then go live.

Alex – Please correct anything I have misstated or failed to include.

Tom Scheitlin
Associate Director
Office of Science Information Management
Office of Research and Development
Phone: 919-541-0707
Cell: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Email: scheitlin.tom@epa.gov

From: Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 12:46 PM

To: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Brielle Kissel Meade <Brielle.Kissel@erg.com>

Subject: Review of OGWDW PWS location information

All,

We have downloaded and reviewed the OGWDW PWS location file (**2015Q4_PWS_Locations_12192019.xlsx**).

Conclusion: This file is likely sufficient to use for the presentation of PWS locations on the National PFAS Data Explorer.

- File contains ~416,000 PWS records
- All of the 4,920 PWS in UCMR 3 with monitoring results are in the file; all but one record has an assigned latitude and longitude.

- There are no duplicate lat/longs.

Question: Can OGWDW update the file to enter a lat/long for DanDan, Saipan?

Question: Can OGWDW confirm that the information contained in the transferred file is not sensitive and can be publicly disseminated?

Question: Can OGWDW provide suitable text describing how this information was generated and any validation analysis for inclusion in the QAPP and project documentation?

FYI: Based on an initial analysis of CA PWS service areas, centroid of ZIP codes served may be more representative of service area than the location of PWS treatment plants.

Method for Assigning Location	Count	UCMR 3	w/lat/long
Active TP with Lat/Long	60,054	3,462	3462
Active Non-TP IS_SOURCE = Y with Lat/Long	61,837	620	620
Active TP address geocode	10,422	344	344
County centroid	132,295	284	284
City served geocode	34,702	170	170
Tribal centroid	815	22	22
Inactive TP with Lat/Long	25,469	13	13
Inactive Non-TP IS_SOURCE = Y with Lat/Long	62,797	3	3
Could not determine	25,210	1	
Inactive TP address geocode	3,125	1	1
Zipcode served geocode	11		
Total	416,737	4,920	4,919

TP= treatment plant

Andrew Stoeckle | VP, Information and Analysis | Eastern Research Group | o. 781.674.7261

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2020 1:12 PM

To: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>

Cc: Brielle Kissel Meade <Brielle.Kissel@erg.com>

Subject: Proposed processing and presentation of OGWDW PWS location information

OGWDW provided a file with a non-sensitive PWS IDs and latitude/longitude values.

Only those PWS IDs that are included in UCMR 3 (only the 4,920 PWS with test results) will be retained

The location information will be merged with the published UCMR 3 information (e.g., PWS name, monitoring results for the six PFAS chemicals) and population served from SDWIS.

An icon will be developed for use on the National PFAS Data Explorer integrated map and on the map presented on the Drinking Water tab of the tool.

The icon can be scaled for two dimensions using color and size.

- Population served > size of icon (there is a risk that changing size will be interpreted as the geographic area of the service area). Unlike the current tool, the icon will be quite visible on the national scale Integrated map; ZIP codes served are not visible at the national scale.

- Maximum concentration of any PFAS > follow same color scheme that the tool currently uses

Note: It is probably useful to conduct a few experiments with the icon visualization. For example, is there value in having small central point at the lat/long as presented in the OGWDW exploded dot.

Andrew Stoeckle | VP, Information and Analysis | Eastern Research Group | o. 781.674.7261



From: Montilla, Alex

Sent: Monday, March 16, 2020 12:01 PM

To: Porteous, Alex <porteous.alex@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: Review of OGWDW PWS location information

Hi Alex,

ERG is working to upload the data into the NDPE. Can you address the questions highlighted below so we can assure we comply with all data protection requirements.

Thanks,

am

Question: Can OGWDW update the file to enter a lat/long for DanDan, Saipan?

Question: Can OGWDW confirm that the information contained in the transferred file is not sensitive and can be publicly disseminated?

Question: Can OGWDW provide suitable text describing how this information was generated and any validation analysis for inclusion in the QAPP and project documentation?

19 March 2020. Mike asked today how OW will amend policy to allow portrayal of the data by point rather than zip code. Alex P. says that OW has allowed people to have access to the data must sign the documents provided. You cannot zoom in so far that you can see the location. Alex P. said that the data is still sensitive. The policy hasn't been changed according to Alex P. Mike reiterated that the AAs discussed the release of the data. Renee said that at this point we have to follow OW guidance. We were asked to change the NDPE interface based on Jennifer's recommendation and the AA's decision but Renee says she needs to work with the OW leadership to provide a waiver to OW policy. Alex P. thinks that point zooming can be restricted somehow to limit details. Alex P. thinks he can set the data settings in Qlik. Andrew S. said that setting the data detail in Qlik is more restrictive than ESRI. Alex P. says we'll need to look at Qlik to see options with lat/long. Visual scale range manipulation is what OW is asking for. A polygon is still resolvable to a point. ERG is asking if obfuscated lat/longs can be provided by OW? ERG is asking for centroid lat/long which OW would create and provide to us to obfuscate the PWS. Renee said they could get the zip code from the UCMR3 data and provide them to us for inclusion the tool (4920 zip codes). OW will tell us what file to use and how to use it and they will give us the necessary caveats and guidance. Alex P. says it will take a couple of weeks for OW to turn around the centroid file but Andrew S. said they can do it faster and Renee was good with that as long as OW received all of the information that was used (original zip and obfuscated point). Will talk with Tim, Tom and Andrew this afternoon about whether ERG should do this or OW.